

" Qal hatu burhanakum in kuntum sadikeen. "

Tell them to bring their argument if they are right.

AL-BAHSUL-JALEEL

OR

THE DEHLI CONTROVERSY

BETWEEN

MOVLVI SHARF-UL-HAQ QADRI, JALALI
Mahomedan Missionary

AND

REVDS. G. A. LEFROY AND PEPLON
And other Members of the Cambridge Mission

PATRONIZED BY

The Lord Bishop of the Punjab in 1891.

WITH A BRIEF EXAMINATION OF

REV. T. WILLIAMS' CRITICISM OF MOHOMADANISM.

Translated by

S. ABDOUL HAI SAHIB,

AND

Published by the Mahomedans of Civil
and Military Station, Bangalore,
for distribution in
ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

No one should publish without the permission of
MOVLVI SHARF-UL-HAQ.

" MORNING STAR PRESS, "

IN THE NAME OF THE
MOST MERCIFUL GOD.

ALL praises are due to the one powerful, the one Eternal God, who has neither wife nor son; God who has no partaker in His authority and power, and who possesses an eternal kingdom; God who warned us by His words against anagram and related to us of the people who forgot Him and say that the Merciful has a son which is undoubtedly a grave impiety; and peace and salutation to the Prophet—a chosen prophet, the lord of arguments and signs, whose signs are bright and who freed all the prophets from the accusations of those who believe in the Trinity and are thus misguided; the prophet whose prophetic career was prophesied very brightly and whose religion subdued all other religions and shattered their standards. Peace and salutation to his descendants, his companions and their followers, his friends and their friends and to all of them. I testify that there is but one God and that Jesus is His servant and prophet.

After the praises due to God and the Prophet, says humble Abdullah of Delhi that the cause of this controversy arose from certain Missionaries of the Cambridge Mission, who came to Delhi for the propagation of their faith. They have for the last twelve years been here and have for a long time been learning Urdu and Persian. Of them the Rev. G. A. Lefroy being desirous of controversy was enquiring of the Mussalmans as to how a certain tenet was believed in and how such a thing was accepted. Munshi Vajid Ali, a student of the Medical College, was attending the open air preaching of the Missionaries and was hearing their sermons delivered in the market-places. My com-

panion, Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq Sabiri of Delhi was, from the beginning of his studentship, desirous of reading the books of the Christians and refuting the arguments therein contained. About two months ago the Rev. Bose delivered a lecture on Sin in the St. Stephen's College, Delhi, under the presidency of the Rev. G. A. Lefroy. Permission had been granted for any one to bring forward his objections, if there were any, after the lecture was delivered. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq thereupon brought forward six objections, which were acknowledged by the Rev. Lefroy, who stood up and said that he was unable to answer them. The objections were to the effect whether Sin was an inheritance, or whether it was the name of certain acts committed, or whether it was a combination of both. If it was an inheritance, then there was no meaning in it, as Adam had no father from whom he could have inherited sin. If sin was an act, it had to be proved that Zechariah and John were sinners, while there was nothing said against them in any of the verses of the Scriptures. If sin was a combination of inheritance and act, this was not applicable to Adam, John and Zechariah. Since you say that sin is an act against law, or a disobedience, then it so happens that Christians are the greatest sinners as God sayeth in the Old Testament in the Book of Exodus to Moses.—“Thou shalt have no other God before me.” Here leaving one God, they have fixed upon three Gods as one says in the following couplet :—“It is written in the Old Testament that there is one God, but the Missionaries have converted him into three.”

Besides the law declares Saturday to be Sabbath and honors it, while all Christians observe Sunday as the Sabbath in violation of the law. Thus they ought to be punished for doing this, just like one who cuts fuel on the Sabbath. The Rev. Bose, I remember well, had said standing that there was sin in the heart of Zechariah and John and they were thus not free from sin. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq on hearing this reply expressed his regret that the Rev. gentleman was bringing forward

his own groundless arguments in opposition to God, who declares all prophets sinless in his Book of Faith. He tries to prove that prophets are sinners, thus opposing the word of God by the force of his wisdom. Besides by his argument he shews himself to be omniscient, which is an attribute of God. How could the Rev. Bose have understood that there was sin in the heart of Zechariah and John. This argument silenced both Messrs. Bose and Lefroy. There were several such discussions between the Rev. Lefroy and Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq on the subject which cannot be encompassed in this small pamphlet. The cause of these three discussions, one after another, was the same Medical student, who once being present in the preaching of the Christians at the Jumma Mosque Bazaar said that there are many discrepancies in the Scriptures and especially there is much difference of opinion in the tenet treating of the crucifixion of Jesus, which is in fact the chief point of salvation and faith, as Christians believe that crucifixion is for the atonement of their sins. The Rev. Lefroy enquired whether he would prove this allegation, and being answered in the affirmative, Friday was fixed for the discussion in the Persian School connected with the Fatahpuri Mosque. As Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq was skilled in such controversial discussions, the student asked his assistance. Sharf, ul-Haq, from want of leisure, being engaged in teaching, tried to excuse himself of this burden, but being insisted on, accepted the proposal. At two o'clock on the day fixed, there assembled about two thousand people and a talk began as to who should stand to speak and discuss. Vajid Ali was for Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq and some wanted a certain Doctor who was present on the occasion. The Rev. Mr. Lefroy did not accept the latter and it was therefore decided that Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq should speak. It had been already decided that every day's discussion should be committed to paper and the signatures of the parties affixed thereto.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST DAY.

Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq on behalf of the student spoke of the inconsistency in the Bible about the two malefactors who were crucified along with Christ, one on his right and the other on his left side,—the one railing on him and the other praising him. In another publication of the Gospel it is written that both the malefactors railed on him. There also appears to be a doubt whether the malefactors to be crucified were two in number or there was only one. In one place two are spoken of as having been crucified, while in another only one seems to have been crucified; for it is written that the malefactor who was crucified with him railed on him. Now which of these two readings are to be considered true and which one to be false. Having said this, the Moulvi Sahib sat down. The Rev. gentleman then stood up and said: "Here the translation is wrong." Here it might be mentioned that before the beginning of the discussion Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq had asked the Missionary whether the existing translations of the Protestant Gospel were correct or not, to which he had replied that almost all the translations were correct. Except in certain delicate points the Rev. gentleman said that he accepted all the translations as genuine ones. When the Missionary sat down saying that the translation was incorrect, the Moulvi Sahib said: "You have before the whole audience declared that the translations are faithful enough, and there is no delicate point here admitting of any inaccurate interpretation." For every one knows the difference in the singular and the plural which happens in each time. It cannot be said that the translators have made such an obvious mistake and if such be the case you have to prove this from a dictionary without which I cannot accept the plea of incorrectness." To prove his statement the Moulvi Sahib presented a Bible being an edition of 1860, published at Calcutta by the Baptist Mission. The Missionary was unable to say anything or to bring forward any argument, but stood up and said that this translation was

from the Baptist Protestants, who interpret the Gospel in their own way. The Moulvi Sahib again said: "You have a moment before acknowledged the accuracy of all the translations and you have stated no reason for such incorrectness. In this particular instance there is no difference of opinion in any sect, including also the Roman Catholics." On hearing this, the Missionary began to look into his English Bible and its several translations very carefully for about five minutes and said, "in all these, two malefactors are mentioned and it is written that the malefactor who was crucified with him, railed on him, which means that one of them who had been crucified with him railed on him." The Moulvi Sahib replied that it was an injustice on the part of Missionary to flourish his meanings and to say what was contrary to the original text. The Moulvi Sahib said, it would be better for him to admit it as an inconsistency as his objections were to the railing of one etc., which ought to be accepted either directly or indirectly. The Missionary again stood up and repeated his old story when the Moulvi Sahib said: "Reverend Sir, I ask you whether the phrase 'he who had been crucified with him' does not clearly point out its antecedent, the malefactor. If it has that signification which you adopt, then the whole phrase becomes meaningless. Does the Holy Ghost, the third person of the Trinity, speak things which are meaningless?" I remember well, the Missionary did not say a word to this nor did he reply anything to the Moulvi's second discourse. After this the Rev. gentleman standing said: "I accept this inconsistency in the Gospel that in one place it is written that both the malefactors railed on him, while in another only one is said to have railed and the other praised him." The Moulvi Sahib said that it was thus a matter for consideration when there are so grave mistakes in describing such a great incident, what reliance can be placed in the Gospel; more so when the writers were eye-witnesses and not only

eye-witnesses but they had been inspired also and had the assistance of the Holy Ghost with them. The Missionary could not say anything to this objection.

It being the time for *Asar* namaz, all the Mussalmans victorious as they were, went to the Mosque for prayer and came back to the place of controversy and then began the discussion about the anagrams in the Scriptures. Moulvi Sharful-Haq, with great force of expression and perspecuity proved another anagram in the Holy Bible from the books written by the Christians, and said not one or two sentences, but books after books have been excluded from the Scriptures. The biographies of the persons who are said to be the authors of these books were written by other persons after the death of the writers, and have been included in the original books. Nor has it been conclusively proved by whom the books have been really written. Before such an enquiry, the books have been, as a matter of fact, accepted as inspired books without knowing who the author was or whether he had been inspired. The Rev. gentleman wanted to know what proof there was for such a statement, and that he was not prepared to accept such a proposition without proof. The Moulvi Sahib then stood up and read John Chap. v.—v. 7, from the Annotated Paragraphic Bible the following: “There are three (that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost) and there are three (that bear witness in earth) the spirit and the water and the blood and these three agree in one.” In all the old Scriptures and in the old translations and in the books of the authors of the ancient Church, words in brackets are not found.

Now it is a point for consideration of the Rev. gentleman, that with all his denial, his own religious books published by Protestants in London and at the cost of the Mission admit of anagram, which could not be denied by the Missionary. “I ask you who has added these words? It is very clear that this

is the act of some one, who is a hypocrite in religion for the proof of the Trinity, as there is no proof of the Trinity either in the Old Testament or in the "Zaboor," the Psalms of David. Besides it ought to be stated, when this addition was made and why, or whether some more verses were excluded? "How can you say that the books which contain these words are wrong." The Missionary on hearing this said very justly that it is true there is an anagram here, but the change was made after due enquiry and the Christians did not conceal this fact but mentioned it openly. Besides some of the verses in the New Testament were forgetfully added by the writers. The Moulvi Sahib then asked the Missionary to point out how many such mistakes there were in the New Testament and how many in the Old Testament. The Missionary answered that he did not remember them. Upon this statement the Moulvi Sahib loudly told the audience how the Missionary was ignorant of his own religious books. The Missionary promised to shew these the next day. The Moulvi Sahib then referred to the several omissions, such as the absence of the Lord's Wars, the Book of the Prophet Gadastor, the Book of Edo Gaib and the remaining Proverbs of Solomon. The Missionary said that he would not there discuss anything regarding the Old Testament; what the Moulvi had to say should be said about the New Testament. The Moulvi Sahib then said that he would do so, but he asked the permission of the Missionary to say something more on the subject. He said that the last Chapter of Deuteronomy contains things that happened after Moses' death. Was the Chapter written by Moses after his death? His statement that there are books, whose authors are unknown and notwithstanding are believed as inspired ones, will be seen if the Rev. gentleman should see the opinion of the commentators regarding Paul's letter to Hebrews, and it is especially mentioned in the Urdu edition of Benares, in which the translators have clearly said

that the letter to the Hebrews is by a nameless author. When there was no trace of the author, what reason was there for the Christians to include it in the inspired Scriptures? What I said about the commentators may be read on page 440 of the same annotated Bible. I am also prepared to say something else regarding the New Testament, though the Rev. gentleman by his acceptance of anagrams in his holy books and by his ignorance of such changes as have been made, had already rendered the Holy Scriptures useless and unworthy of any authority being quoted from them. Now what I have to observe is that should I present a certain verse in proof of my statement and should the Missionary stand up and say that the verse did not belong to the Bible, what could I then do? The Missionary replied that he would not do so and wanted to know what it was. The Moulvi Sahib said that it was one of Paul's letters. The Missionary wanted to know the name of the letter. The Moulvi Sahib then asked the Missionary whether there was an anagram in any of the verses; and whether the orders therein contained were not inspirations. The Missionary said there was no anagram and that the orders contained were inspirations, and inspired orders only had to be acted upon, and asked the name of the chapter which contained the letter. The Moulvi Sahib asked the Missionary to read chapter IV of Colossians, verse 16 and himself reading the letter asked the Missionary to prove that the Ladician's letter was an inspired writing. If it was not, how was it that pious Paul enjoined the reading of the letter like the inspired writing of letter to Colossians. The Moulvi said that it was for this reason that he had already taken the promise of the Missionary to the effect that the letter was an inspired writing. One of the learned men of the Catholic Church, the Rev. Badilee in his book translated by Thomas Engleson, mentions this ladician letter in the list of the lost inspired writings. Mirat-as-Sidkh pp. 3, lines 8-9 which is with

me may be seen. Not only one book but also verse xx chapter xxi of John declares that all acts of Jesus were not written down. The books of his acts would have been so numerous that the world could not have contained them. Now we can say that in all these acts and statements, there were statements prophesying the advent of our Prophet, and in all those lost inspired writings there should have been details of the prophet, which have not been written down. Notwithstanding such a state of things, there are in the same books such clear prophecies concerning the advent of our Prophet, as are not to be found regarding any other prophet. After this those present went for the evening prayer and came back to the place of discussion. Moulvi Sharf ul-Haq said that the prophecies in the Old Testament etc. regarding Christ are not so clear as those for the Prophet. The Missionary then stood up and said that all about Christ was not written down and asked whether there was any information about Muhomed in the New Testament. The Moulvi Sahib said that there are not one only but there are several such references in the New Testament and that he did not read the New Testament with proper attention. The Missionary said: "Show me in what book and in what chapter and verse." The Moulvi Sahib then showed several prophecies from the books and placed them before the Missionary asking him to notice them. Moulana Allah Dia said that before such evidences regarding the prophet are pointed out, there should be some rules between the disputants so that both should have no ground for divergence, and that no difference of opinion should exist. Sharf-ul-Haq asked the missionary to fix certain rules for the purpose, as the latter was the person who wanted to know the prophecies, and then he would point them out in accordance with the lines stated by the Rev. gentleman. He asked the Missionary whether the truth of prophecy depended on miracles and foretellings. If so he wanted the Missionary to point out any prophecy about Moses from any inspired writer's work. The Missionary on hearing this was rather startled and after thinking over the matter for a considerable time said that the truth of prophecy does not depend on miracle and foretelling. The Maulvi then addressed one Hafiz Sahib and said: "Lo! Sir

you can now become a prophet without miracle and foretelling, and that the Revd. Gentleman can not now doubt the prophecy of Muhammad (peace to his name) without miracle and foretelling' The Missionary being very much confused and surprised said that foretelling was necessary for the last of the prophets and such were Muhammad and Christ in the opinions of Mussalmans and Christians respectively, so prophecies are necessary in the case of Muhammad. The Maulvi Sahib replied: If that be the case, prophecy sometimes depends on miracle and foretelling and sometimes not. The proof then, of prophecy which admits of the existence of both, the first and the last of the prophets depends on miracles and foretelling and does not depend as well. This rejoinder greatly confused the Missionary and he was not able to say anything. Maulvi Sharf - ul - Haq then addressed the Missionary saying: "Reverend Sir, if you prove the prophecy of Christ from the Old Testament, by what miracle and prophetic sayings are you prepared to prove that Moses, the author of the Old Testament is a prophet? If the prophecy of Moses be not established from any previous book and miracle, under what rule will you prove the prophecy of Christ by the Old Testament. Your rule thus deprives Christ of his prophecy. The Jews consider Moses as the last of the prophets as is laid down in chapter 34 - V - 10 of Deuteronomy 'and there arose not a prophet from amongst the Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face.' It would then follow that there should be a foretelling for Moses also. Under your rule neither Moses nor Christ is a prophet. The missionary again said the same thing, viz, that Mohamed is according to your belief the last prophet, foretelling is necessary for him. The Moulvi Saib regretted that the Missionary did not reply to his questions and that how unjust it was for him not to fix a rule as to how the previous prophet foretells about the coming one, so that he might point out the prophecies according to this rule. It would, said the Moulvi, be necessary for the missionary to prove from the Old Testament that foretelling was necessary for the last of the prophets. Owing to night-fall it was eventually arranged that the proceedings should be continued on Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The discussionists on either side arrived at the appointed hour. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq sided with the Muhammadans and the Rev. G. A. Lefroy, of the Cambridge Mission, took up the cause of the Christians. The audience numbered about 8000. Of these may be mentioned the following distinguished personages:— Mr. Deputy Syed Hadi Hussain Khan Saib Extra Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Syod Sultan Mirza Sahib Honorary Magistrate, Hafiz Azizuddin Sahib, Ploader, Hakim Badruddin Khan Sahib and Mr. Khari Hafiz Allah Dia. Among the merchants there were present. Sheik Nur Ilahi Sahib and his brother, Haji Mahomed Ahmed Saib with several others. There were also many of the learned men of Delhi. At the beginning one of the chief explained to the audience the reason of the meeting being called and exhorted the learned Muhammadans to oppose their antagonists and subdue them in the discussion. He regretted that they had at present lost all that spirit which actuated the learned in former days and related as an instance the discussion of Moulvi Shah Abdul Aziz Sahib (God's Mercy be on him.) He praised the venture of Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq, who for the sake of God had girded up his loins on behalf of his religion. He is not an insignificant man who for the sake of bread had taken to this work. He belongs to a noble and well to do family and is the son of Hafiz Muhammad Jalaluddin, a famous member of the community. Then he said that he trusted so much in the Rev. Lefroy that though the Heaven and Earth should pass away, the words of the Revd. Gentleman which he had already spoken and would speak hereafter would not be undone. He trusted that the Missionary would commit to writing whatever he said on Friday. Maulvi Sharf-ul-Haq then stood up and desired that he should affix his signature to the paper containing the subject matter of the discussion. The Missionary asked the Maulvi to state what the subjects were, when the Moulvi Sahib reminded him of having accepted in the first meeting that there were anagrams and poets' sayings in his Holy books and moreover he did not himself understand the Gospel. Hearing this the Missionary said that he did not say there was ana-

gram in the books, but what he said was that there were alterations and these too in the translations and not in the original text. The Maulvi Sahib regretted such a stout denial on the part of the Missionary and said that as just stated by him he had no objection to regard these as mere alterations. But this makes no difference as both anagram and alteration indicate the same. That there were alterations in the translations could not be true as it was impossible to interpret wrongly unless there were alterations in the original text. How would the Missionary account for the omission of verse after verse. Saying this the Maulvi read Jhon Chap. V. 7 from the annotated Bible together with the commentary thereon. After hearing, the Missionary was obliged to accept that there were mistakes and alterations in the original books, but added that all such errors were known. The Maulvi Sahib on hearing this enquired of the Missionary as to how he came to know that there were mistakes in these books and that there were none at all in other editions of these books. He wanted him to prove his statement either by recourse to arguments or from narratives and history warning him at the same time that such proofs had not to be adduced from the Bible, as that was the book the authenticity of which was in question. The Missionary then said that the Maulvi was speaking of a thing which would lead to a dispute and that he was unable to answer the question as it was upon a disputed point, and that the Maulvi wanted to deviate from the main point — that of establishing the prophecy concerning Muhammad. After hearing this, it was considered necessary that the words of the Missionary should by him be committed to paper and his signature affixed thereto. Thereupon the Missionary wrote in Roman Urdu characters the following:—

(1) I promise that in the translations of the Grecian Gospel and besides in many of the original books now extant, some verses are erroneous and have been forgetfully included. This was known after a comparison of the old books and their several translations in which these verses were not found. (2) I respect therefore the statements of the original Gospel alone. There are many things in the Bible which are beyond conception of my

defective judgment. (3) Some statements of Eastern poets are also included in the Bible.

Signed G. A. LEFROY,

Afterwards the Maulvi Sahib addressed the meeting and asked the audienco to pay attention to what he had to Say. In the controversy on Friday the Missionary had agreed to all the objections of the Moulvi and one of the chief men had asked the Maulvi to point out in the Bible a prophecy about Muhammad, failing which he had declared that he would follow the Missionary; and in reply to that, the speaker had promised to relate the prophecy, after which it would be necessary for the Missionary to accept the Islamic faith, to which the Reveroned gentleman had assented. After saying this, Maulvi Sharf-ul-Haq asked the Missionary to explain the usual way in which a preceding prophet foretells the coming of his successor in the sacred Mission. Was it necessary that the words concerning the prophecy should in all their extent apply to the coming prophet, or whether the application of a few such words would suffice? Have all the attributes of the coming prophet to be mentioned or a few only. In short the definition of the prophecy should be such as to admit of a general rule, and a criterion to distinguish between what is a prophecy and what is not; so that in the end there should be no dispute. The missionary had already declared that the truth of prophetic missions did not necessarily rest on miracles or foretellings and that such proofs were needed only in the case of the last of the prophets, who according to the belief was Christ for Christians and Mahammad for Mahammadans. The Maulvi continued that the discussion of the day should be the same and that before its beginning the Missionary, ought to prove from the Old Testament his statement that prophecy was necessary only in the case of the last of the prophets and unless this is established mere words of his cannot be accepted. The Missionary tells us that there is the necessity for prophecy in the case of the last of the prophets, and we deny that Christ is the last of the prophets and we have our authority in Acts Chap. XII - V. 27 for our denial. Prophecy of the preceding prophet about the coming of one requires fixed rule for the

reason that no dispute should arise hereafter between the parties as to who the last prophet is. The advisability of fixing such a rule was apparent. If there was any thing inconsistent in his speech, the Moulvi requested the audience to correct him or else prevail on the Missionary to accept his proposals so that the discussion might very soon begin. The Missionary stood up and repeated his old story saying that the Moulvi wavered to mention the prophecy regarding Muhammad and that there was no need for fixing any such rule; and that he did not like to become a disputant. The Moulvi Sahib then stood up and said that he was prepared to relate the prophecy, but he regretted the delay on the part of the Missionary, who had claimed that prophecy was necessary for the last of the prophets and that Christ was the last prophet; whereas the Moulvi had proved from Acts XI Chap, that such was not the case, so it was incumbent on the part of the Rev. Gentleman to state the ingredients which go to form the prophecy, as until this point is settled there will be no end to the discussion. The mentioning of such a rule will result in an advantage to the Missionary, as the Moulvi will then be restricted to relate the prophecy on the lines laid by him, and to point out the applicability of the prophecy to Muhammad. The Missionary again declined to fix any rule and further said that he would not mention anything about the cessation of the prophetic Mission. The Missionary said that he would leave the place if the prophecy was not pointed out to him. After this a famous preacher stood up and said that he would say something to continue the discussion between the parties and that was to the effect that the Missionary should relate the prophecy about Christ as an example, so that Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq might mention a similar one about Mahomed (peace be on him) and by this means settle the dispute that existed. Rev. Lefroy on hearing this said that although he had no desire to become an opposer by saying anything, yet he would do so to please him; and read Mathew Chap. I, V. 22-23. Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying: "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, 'God with

us'." See how this prophecy was fulfilled in Isaiah Chap. VII. V., and how every Muhammadan accepts that Christ was born of Virgin Mary. Emmanuel is from *El God*, and *emmano with us*. Having said this much the Missionary sat down. Moulvi Sharf ul Haq then stood up and said that this particular prophecy was not applicable to Jesus as the word *Ulmaho* in the original Hebrew text of Isaiah, which has been interpreted by Christians a virgin, means a matured woman and applies both to married and unmarried woman; and saying this the Moulvi pointed out the meaning of this word in the Hebrew Dictionary by the Rev Hooper, Principal of the Divinity College, Allahabad, and also said that there was an anagram in the text. It is written in Isaiah Chap. VII, and Verse 14, that she would name him "Emmanuel," and in Mathew it is written that they would name him 'Emmanuel'. It is plain that there is a vast difference between Femenine singular 3rd Person and Masculine plural of the third person. The plagiarism seems to be the work of one who is a cheat of religion. Besides to call Christ Emmanuel is wrong, as neither his mother Mary nor the people called him by this name. If Emmanuel was his name, he would have been known by that name. That this prophecy is not applicable to Christ is conclusively proved by verse 15 of the same Chapter, wherein it is written that he would eat curd and honey when so empowered as to do good and to forsake evil. If this is a prophecy about Christ there crop up two evils, one of them the eating of curd by Christ, of which the Bible gives no proof whatever; and the other evil being that by your supposition Christ himself is God. I crave protection of God if this is his attribute that sometimes he has discretionary power, while at other times not, and that he should be given the power to discriminate between good and evil by some one else. Besides it is passing strange that Christians take this prophecy as an argument for Christ's divinity. We Mussalmans do believe that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, and should this belief be denied nothing on earth could prove the prophecy of Christ and his wonderful birth. To sum up you have not established your proposition from the book of Isaiah. After saying this the Maulvi Sahib resumed his seat. The Missionary stood up and said if the pro-

phesy was not applicable to Christ let the learned Moulvi point out to whom the prophecy refers, and further there was nothing inconsistent in the words 'she would call' or 'they would call,' and that such criticisms should not be made. The Moulvi Sahib replied that it was not for him to say to whom the prophecy under reference was applicable, but that it did not refer to Christ was very clear, yet he would invite his attention to Chapter VIII of Isaiah, where it is said 'O Emmanuel etc.' and then requested the Missionary to answer his objections. The Revd. Gentleman declared that he was not prepared to answer such criticisms. Meanwhile the hour for Asar Namaz approaching all present went for the prayer. The Maulvi Sahib before quitting the place to perform the Namaz addressed the Missionary and said that if the latter had fixed certain rules and a standard for judging the prophecy there would have been no more words to speak with and that by not doing so he had endangered his own cause. After Namaz when every one assembled again, the Maulvi Sharf-ul Haq raised his hands for prayer and in a pathetic tone asked all present to pray with him for his victory and at the same time implored God to open the heart of the Missionary and his companion to understand what he was to say in support of Muhomed's prophecy. He asked the Missionary to open the Bible and look at Jhon Chap. I. V. 19 23 which contained the following: "And this is the record of Jhon, when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, who art thou? (20) and he confessed and denied not: but confessed I am not the Christ (21) and they asked him what then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? and he answered No." The meaning of these verses is that when Jhon, son of Zechariah began to preach, the Jews sent to him priests and Levites to ask him who he was. In the Christian language Yahya is called Jhon the Baptist, and there is another Jhon, the Apostle. He replied then that he was neither the Christ nor Elias, nor he was that prophet (Muhammad, peace be on his name.) "That prophet" was written here out of respect; for when a person is respected more we usually drop the name and say 'that Sahib' or 'that Master.' In this place the same idiom has been used. If the Christians do not accept

this, let them point out who that prophet was who came after Jews. It is thus a proof that the preceding prophet when prophesying about the coming one does so indirectly as was the case with Jhon, who told his enquirers that he was, as prophesied by Isaiah Chap. 4. V. 3. a crier in the wilderness who tells the people of one God and asks them to tread in the path of the Lord. If the prophecy was a direct one and had the Jews known it in Isaiah Chap. 4. 3. they would not have sent the priests and the Levites to make enquiry of Jhon. Again Mahomed is the prophet, whose advent was expected by the holy Peter vide Acts 3 Chap. V. 19 - 26. "Repent ye therefore, and be converted that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; (20) and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: (21) whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. (22) For Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all thing whatever he shall say unto you (23) and it shall come to pass, that every soul, which will not hear the prophet shall be destroyed from among the people (24) Ye and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days (25) Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers saying unto Abraham and in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed." The explanation of the above verses is this that the holy Peter is preaching among the Jews and advises them to repent and to be converted so that their sins may be forgiven and refreshing times may come and Jesus Christ shall come from the heaven at the last time being sent by God. The most important of all that Peter said was an event that was to decending on earth again. This is the prophecy mentined in Dentonomy Chap. XVIII. V 18. to the effect that a prophet like Moses viz. Mahomed (peace be on his name) shall come whom you shall obey and if you do not you shall be punished. Many prophets have foretold of the days and spoken of God's promise to Abraham that the kind-

reds of the Earth shall be blessed in his seed being fulfilled. The Moulvi said that the Missionary ought to think over carefully as to the person about whom these two prophecies had been spoken, and the holy Peter who was the judge between us and the Christians, proclaimed to the world that this prophecy remains unfulfilled. If the prophecy had come to pass, there would have been no necessity to mention it in this place. It ought to be stated that the words "your brethern" do not allude to the Israelites but to others who are not Israelites—namely to Ismailites, or to the children of Esau or those of Khutara. Besides all have agreed that there was no prophet among the two latter clans. There then remained the Bani Ismailites among whom no one Expect Mahomed (peace to his name) claimed to be the Prophet, nor there came any other like unto Moses save him. That Mahomed was like unto Moses can be proved by the following points of similarity: (1) As Moses will not come into the world again after leaving it, so Mahomed will not come again. (2) As Moses had his wife and children, so Mahomed had. (3) Both had their parents. (4) Both inflicted punishment on evil doers. (5) Both conducted religious wars. (6) Both enjoined the making of ablutions at the time of prayers. (7) The laws of both make bathing and washing compulsory for certain impurities. (8) The law of both punishes adulterers, whereas in the Bible adultery is openly encouraged (see Jhon Chap. VIII) and the crucified Christ has thus according to the Bible lost his chastity and restricted the order of the Old Testament (see Chap. VII.) (9) Both ordered the keeping clean of garment and body from urine and excrement. (10) Both prevented the eating of an animal not sacrificed in the name of God. (11) Both enjoined worship and austerity. (12) Both appointed judges for the settlements of cases. (13) Usury was made unlawful by both. (14) Both ordered the holding of consultation in important affairs. (15) Both impressed the falsehood of miracles which had for their object the worship of other deities besides God. (16) Both appointed places for the worship of God. (17) Both were called the servants and prophets of God by their respective followers and not God or the son of God. (18) Both died of sickness. (19) Both did not save

themselves alone from the hands of their enemies, but also saved their friends. (20) Both were neither cursed nor cast into Hell for three days for the salvation of mankind as was the case with the crucified Christ, who according to Christian tradition remained three days in Hell to save men.

Wonderful is the faith of the Missionary and the Christians who for their own interests render their God cursed and make him remain three days in hell and yet accuse the Mussalmans that they do not appreciate the acts of Christ. Woe unto them who turn a man into God and then make him cursed and hellish. St. Paul by his statement that Christ bought and freed us from the curse of the law and was therefore himself cursed as it is written that 'cursed is the person who is crucified' did not leave any more indecent language to be spoken against Christ and to prove this the Maulvi sahib not only read passages from Chapter III of Galatians but also read the following passage from the Common Prayer, "Who suffered for our salvation, descended to hell, rose again the third day." I do well recollect that the Missionary on hearing this argument was greatly confused and changed color. Though he was often requested to reply to the arguments used, he nevertheless kept quite. On the Moulvi saib resuming his seat, the Missionary stood up and said that the prophecy mentioned by the Moulvi was from the Chapter XVIII of Deuteronomy to which Peter in the acts, Chap. III alludes. In this place there was no reference to the Ismailites but it referred to the Israelites. In the language of the Old Testament wherever "thy brethren" was mentioned it referred to the Israelites and not to the Ismailites who were never called as brethren to the Israelites. The prophecy referred to Christ and not to Muhammad. It was necessary for the Moulvi that he should read Deuteronomy Chap. 18 and verse 15 which contained the following: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." In the above verse there was a word which removed all doubt that the prophecy was not for Mahomed, but it was for one who shall be raised from among the Israelites and their brethren. The Moulvi has impressed on the audience that the prophecy

was for Mahomed but he should think over the matter. Though there was some resemblance between Moses and Mahomed in raging wars and propagating their religions by the sword, and Christ did not do so as he was of a gentle and peaceable nature. The Missionary after saying this sat down and the Moulvi replied that the Missionary said nothing about the first prophecy mentioned in Jhon. It was true that the prophecy mentioned in Chapter III of the Act was an extract from Chap. XVIII of Denteronomy but his mention of it was to prove that the holy Peter, in contradiction to the belief entertained by the Christians considered the prophecy unfulfilled and said that it shall be fulfilled between the time of Christ's going to heaven & his coming again. Until all the things prophesied shall be fulfilled the heavens shall bear Christ. The Missionary's statement that the reference made pointed to the Israelites & not to the Ismailites was also wrong, as well as his other statement about the language used in the old Testament; for it is proved contrary to this from Chap. XVI. V. 12. that " he (Ismael) shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren. " By ' brethern ' here the decendants of Sarah and khutora are meant. Another proof is found in Genesis Chap. XXV. V. 18 " And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Aasyria: and he died in the presence of all his brethren, " as also in Chap. XX. V. 14 of Numbers " and Moses sent messenger from Kaderh unto the king of Edon, Thus Saith thy brother Israel, 'Thou knowest all the travel that hath befallen us: ' It is clear that the king of Edon was not from the Israelites and yet Moses called him brother, while, which goes to prove that the word brother is applied to others also who are not Israelites. - The fourth proof is found in Chap. II V. 4 of Denteronomy: " and command thou the people, saying, ye are to pass through the coast of your brethren the children of Esan. ' Here the Children of Esan were called brethren of the Israelites. The fifth proof is found in Chap. XXIII. V. 7 of the same book; " Thou shalt not abhor Edomite; for he is thy brother. After saying this the Moulvi asked the Missionary whether the latter wanted any more proofs and addressing the audience called the attention to the quotations he had mention-

When it is proved that the Old Testament loudly defies the denial of the Missionary that the word brethren applies to others who are not the children of Israel, it then follows that the Missionary is ignorant of the language of the Old Testament in which the children of Esau and Ismael have been called brethren of Israelites; hence the Missionary's statement that the prophecy refers to Christ and not to Mahomed is obviously wrong. Since it is proved that the foretold prophet will not be of the Israelites but will be like Moses. There was concurrence of opinion that with the exception of the children of Ismael among whom arose Mahomed no one claimed to be a prophet among the children of either Khatra or Esau. The Moulvi said that he had already shown how beautifully Mahomed (peace with him) resembled Moses. In regard to the Missionary's statement about chap. xviii. v. 15. the Moulvi Saib said that what was mentioned in it was from Moses, but in chap. xviii. v. 18. God spoke himself and in this nothing was said about the prophet being one of the Israelites. No sensible man, the Moulvi said, would prefer Moses' statement to God's. This prophecy, said Sharf-ul-Haq, was mentioned in four places, viz. Deuteronomy chaps. xviii. v. 15; xviii. v. 18; the Acts chap. iii. v. 22. and chap. vii. v. 37. In the first of these the words "from the midst of thee" are mentioned, while in the other three places nothing is said about the "midst of thee." It was thus a matter for the Missionary's decision as to which of them should be accepted and which had to be considered an inspiration of the Holy Ghost, the third in the Trinity. If one contradicted the other there was reason to believe that these were not God's words and that some one who was a cheat in religion had made these changes whose faults and flaws had been so publicly exposed. The Moulvi said that there was nothing inconsistent in his statement and the prophecies he mentioned were more than enough to convince the Missionary of the truth of his discourse. There was no doubt, said the Moulvi, that the impressions he made were being felt by the Missionary and implored the assistance of God to open up the eye of the Missionary's mind to see in proper light the truth of his arguments. In the matter of

"*Jahad*" (religious war, the Moulvi said that the Missionary's statement that Christ did not wish to do so was incorrect in as much as He (Christ) had no occasion to carry a religious war. Had there been an occasion for such a thing Christ would never have failed to do so. Even with his inability Christ allowed one of his disciples to draw the sword and cut the ear of Hannanialis' servant, and also said that he did not come to unite but to draw the sword. It was a matter for regret that the Missionary having accepted the resemblance of Mahomed to Moses and by saying that both carried on religious war for forcible conversion had not only disrespected Moses but also all other prophets, as the Old Testament declares openly that not only Moses carried on religious wars but also Joshua, David etc. and these prophets have spent a greater part of their lives in waging wars.

With regard to the gentle and humble nature of Christ, boasted of by the Missionary the Moulvi Sahib said that the Mahomedans did not deny it, but argued that the perfection of this quality as was to be found in Mahomed could not be traced in any one of the other prophets. The troubles and hardships which Mahomed (peace be to him) suffered at the hands of his enemies are so numerous that they cannot be mentioned in the short time at our disposal. It is obvious that during the time of Moses, Jesus and the other prophets, there were not so many opponents of God as were at the time of Muhammad. In his time, so to speak, the whole human race was against him. The Jews and the Christians of the time were no more than Pagans; the idolators were plunged in deep idolatry; the Christians who ought to have worshipped the one God were worshipping idols of Jesus and Mary; the fire-worshippers were under the erroneous impression of Fire being the Deity. There were many who were worshipping stars; some had the audacity of calling angels the daughters of God. In short the whole world was plunged in different idolatrous practices. Muhammad arose in the midst of a nation among whom there was no prophet after Ismael. A single man in the person of the holy prophet had to encounter so many nations who were all his opponents. The idolators of Mecca persecuted him to the utmost of their power,

and he suffered various troubles at their hands. The boundless patience Muhammad possessed enabled him to suffer these persecutions cheerfully, and he did not at any time raise his hands up for cursing his persecutors. Whenever he prayed, he prayed for the good of his persecutors saying: "*Alla humma ihdi fa innakum la yalamoon.*" O God! lead my people into the direct path, for they know not. On a certain day at the fair of Bhar-uz Zaj he was preaching and admonishing the people saying: "*Ya aiyo haunas, khulu lu ilaha illallah, tuyliho.*" O men, say there is but one God and obtain salvation! Abu Lahab cast stones at him and did not allow the preaching to continue. When the prophet left the place, he followed him exhorting the people not to hear Muhammad as he was mad. Abu Juhai persecuted him very often and fixed a price of one hundred camels for any one who might kill Muhammad. Once Abu Juhai inflicted such a severe wound on Muhammad's head that blood came out rushing and when this cruel act was retaliated by Humza—the uncle of Muhammad—the Prophet was displeased at him and addressed him saying: "My uncle, your abandoning idolatry will heal my wound; you better believe in the unity of God and accept me as His prophet." While returning after a sojourn of one and half a month at Taaif, where Muhammad had been preaching, the town people set up number of boys to follow him, and all threw stones at him. Both Muhammad and his companion Zaid, son of Huris, were severely wounded, and Muhammad's heel began to bleed. Once when Muhammad was praying in the temple of Mecca, Abu Juhai seeing him at *Sijda* (act of kneeling down) placed over him guts of a camel, which were so heavy that the Prophet was not able to raise his head until he was assisted by his daughter Fatima. Having said this the Moulvi Sahib sat down and the Missionary rose up and said: "In all these places the prophecy refers to the children of Israel," vide chap. xvii, v. 15 Deuteronomy, wherein it is said: "Thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee, which is not thy brother." The Moulvi Sahib said that the authority quoted

above was not in any way against him as it is evident from v. 12. chap. xvi of Genesis that Ismael will dwell in the presence of his brethren, which goes to prove that Ismaelites have been called brethren of Israelites. The Missionary said that the passage read also referred to Israelites, when the Moulvi said that it was a rather surprising fact that Ismael should dwell in the presence of Ismaelites which signification renders the passage not only inconsistent but also erroneous. The Missionary then wanted to know why the Moulvi had quoted verse 4 from chap. iii of Deuteronomy as there was no reference to it to the children of Ismael. The Moulvi answered that all his authorities were to prove the fact that in the language of the Old Testament the word 'brethren' has been applied to others who were not the children of Israel. The Missionary then said that the similarity of Christ to Moses concerning *Jahad* had also been proved and it was for the Moulvi to declare Christ a religious warrior or one of a peaceable nature; he (the Moulvi) cannot say that Christ was humble and at the same time given to warfare. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq stated that it was not his object to prove that Christ waged war and thus resembled Moses. What he said was that Christ had a desire for *Jahad* but was unable to accomplish his object in consequence of being powerless. In this particular instance there is a complete resemblance between Moses and Muhammad, though Muhammad's *Jahad* greatly lessened the severity which the *Jahad* of Moses enjoined. After this, the Missionary wanted to know what similarity there was between Moses and Muhammad in being born of parents as in this respect every one resembled Moses. The Moulvi Sahib said that he and the Missionary were speaking about the applicability of the prophecy not to all but to Christ and Muhammad and it was therefore out of point to include others in the same. There can be no advantage or disadvantage in admitting that those prophets were born of their parents. The Missionary then said that when God declared that He shall raise a prophet from among the brethren, it referred to the children of Israel alone, as for instance if he asked him to get him a *Munshi* from among his brethren, will the Moulvi bring

a man belonging to the Hindu sect? The Moulvi said that the example was not a suitable one, and would have been appropriate in case Ismael was not following the way of his father and that the children of Ismael were not the brethren of Israelites. The Moulvi here laid stress on the injustice the Missionary was doing by his determination to misinterpret God's words and to prefer his own propositions thereby damaging the piety of holy men who had God with them. Is the term brother applicable to one's own brother? Are not the descendants of the same grand-father called brethren especially when in God's holy words they are designated brethren? (Vide Genesis chap. xvi and 16 v.) Besides in verso 18, chap. xviii of Deuteronomy there is a word which defeats all the arguments of the Reverend gentleman viz. "from them from amongst their brethren." Here the pronoun them refers to Israelites. All the Israelites who were born after Moses had their fathers and grandfathers in the camp of Moses. If it was the desire of God to raise that most honored who was promised prophet from among the Israelites, he would not have spoken "from amongst their brethren" but would have said amongst these persons or from their descendants. Moreover in the prophecy there is a word which loudly declares that the promised prophet will have no ancestral connection with the Israelites. If the Missionary was not in a position to accept this interpretation he should point out the use of the pronoun "them." I remember well, that the Missionary did not reply to this well weighed argument but said that Muhammad did not resemble Moses as it was written in the law of Moses that every one should offer sacrifices three times a year in the temple of Jerusalem. Besides there was the atonement for sins in the law of Moses and now no Mussulman atones for his sins. Thirdly sacrifices were offered both in the evenings and in the mornings in the temple. The Moulvi Sahib said that the Missionary did not reply to his twenty of the points of resemblance which showed that silence was consent and now wants to test, about other resemblances. 'By the grace of God,' said the Moulvi, 'all Mahomedans have been enjoined to go on pilgrimage and

just as people visit the temple of Jerusalem the Muslims go on pilgrimage to *Caaba* year after year and offer up sacrifices and thus obey the commands of God.' The sacrifices offered during *Edi Zoha* are for the atonement of sins as the prophet has said 'that God accepts the blood and awards merit for each hair, and forgives sins.' As to the sacrifice in the temple the Moulvi said that God says in the *Quran* "*Fasalli larabbika vanher*" pray for thy God and offer sacrifices for him. It may be mentioned here that during his speech the Missionary had said that leaving aside the journey to Jerusalem, thrice not one of the Mussalmans assembled here had, in the whole of his life, been to Jerusalem. The Moulvi Sahib on hearing this continued and asked the Missionary to think twice over what he was speaking as the Moulvi himself had been to Jerusalem and had from that place sent a letter to the Rev. gentleman. Of the assembled Shaik Noor Ahmed who had first returned from his travels through Syria and Turkey said that he was one of those who had recently visited Jerusalem. On hearing this the Missionary sat down being greatly ashamed and perplexed and the colour of his face changed. The Moulvi Sahib said: "My religion lays down that a prayer in the temple of Jerusalem is equal to a thousand prayers and the Mussalmans hold the temple in such a high veneration that the Prophet has said 'that it was requisite to set on a journey to three places only, namely the temple at Mecca, the *Mosque* at Medina and the temple of Jerusalem. Besides it has been related that he who observes *ghram* (an act of devotion during pilgrimage) at the base of *sukhrat allah*, a rock in Jerusalem all his sins are forgiven. After saying this the Moulvi sat down and the Missionary rising said: "it is written in chap xxxiv. v. 10 of Deuteronomy that there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord know face to face; here to resemble Moses there is the necessity of speaking to God face to face." The Moulvi Sahib said that his Master the Prophet had during *miraj* (night journey) spoken to God in person and this *miraj* was similar to the one which the Missionary believed in the case of Paul in that he

went up to the third heaven. The Moulvi declared that the Missionary did not say anything about the first prophecy which he quoted from chap. i. of John and his silence showed that he accepted it. It was therefore incumbent on the Missionary to embrace Islam as promised by him. Nor did the Missionary say anything about the authority he quoted from chap. iii. of the Acts as to how it was that Peter considered the prophecy to be incomplete and told when preaching that repentance was necessary for the people so that they may find refreshing times and that Christ may come from the heaven, until then he said the heaven would bear Christ and that the prophecy would be fulfilled between Christ's going from and coming again to this earth. There is another reference in verse 26 of the same chapter which says that God first sent Christ and that the foretold prophet (Muhammad) would come after him. Besides it is written in Deuteronomy chap. xviii, verse 20, that when the prophet shall not obey and shall say something in the name of God which he had no command to do or say something for other deities he shall be killed. Hence according to the above authority Christ would come under the category of being disrespectful, and one who helped heathenism. If not the Doctrine of the Trinity which is the pivot on which the modern Christianity turns falls to the ground. It is evident that the crucified Christ was crucified because he instructed his disciples in the Doctrine of the Trinity. Thus it is clear that the prophecy does not refer to Christ in any way and should it be so considered the whole structure of the Christian religion would fall to pieces, for the foundation of the present Christianity depends on the doctrines of Trinity and atonement and should Trinity be not proved atonement itself will vanish. On hearing this the Missionary was so much distracted in mind that he said, "Enough Sir, I have no more brain power, I cannot speak any further." The Moulvi Sahib said that on his part he was ready to continue, and asked the Missionary to show cause why he was not able to speak as he on that day had not spoken more than two hours and a half, whereas he continued speaking for five hours on the First Day, notwithstanding that he had

come from the village of Sohana on the very day and thus looked fatigued. The missionary again said that he was not able to speak; that his brain was in a perplexed state. The Moulvi then addressing the audience said that all present might bear witness to what had passed. That he had brought forward four or five reasonable objections to the prophecy mentioned by the Missionary as being applicable to Christ which as all of them knew were not replied to by the Missionary. On the other hand he (the Moulvi) gave satisfactory answers to the objection raised by the Missionary regarding the prophecies he mentioned about Mahommed (peace be on him) and the result was that the Missionary not being able to answer put a stop to his speech. The discussion being over, it was necessary and incumbent on the Reverend gentleman to embrace Islam as promised and thus redeem himself of his promise with a view to prove himself faithful to his words. After this discussion took place as to the day and the place of future controversy when Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq said that for certain reasons it was not advisable to hold the meeting in the Fatahpuri. Some one said that the members of the Fatahpuri did not like to permit further discussion. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq said that as the discussion for which they all assembled ended on the day, so it was the duty of the Missionary to arrange for a place and send for the Moulvi. The Missionary said he had no place, but when the whole of Delhi should become a Christian place, he would have many houses. The Moulvi replied that when Gentlemen like Mr. Quilliam and others at Liverpool had become converts to Islam he hoped that not only the able and just Missionary would not forsake such a heavenly boon Islam, but all other Christians would embrace it. If such a thing was not possible now, said the Moulvi, all would become Mussulmans on the advent of Mahdi and even Christ would follow the religion of Islam after he comes again. There will be one flock and one shepherd in the blessed person of *Hazrat Mahommed* (peace be on him.) On the first day the Reverend Mr. Lefroy had with him Revd. Piplom, Revd. C. Munro and Mr. Abraham, a Catechist. On the second day, Mr. Lefroy had with him Abraham and another native Christian. The meet-

ing was over. Mr. Lefroy before leaving the place said that he would go to Lahore the very day and told the Moulvi Sahib to give to Abraham any letter, &c., which might be intended for him. It might be mentioned here that when the Missionary spoke a second time about the gentle nature of Christ, the Moulvi while speaking of the patience and meekness possessed by Mahomed stated that once the Prophet was preaching in Caaba, when the Khuraish tribe came there, persecuted and beat him. The prophet bearing all their persecutions patiently, came to Khudaija when she consoled him. The Prophet wept and said that he had no one to assist him but God. In the meanwhile Gabriel came to him with three more angels. The Prophet asked him who his companions were, Gabriel thereupon told him that one of them was the wind under his control; the second angel was the master of water and the third had control over all the mountains. These said Gabriel had been sent by God to be under the orders of the Prophet in order he might take vengeance upon his persecutors. After enquiring of each, the power he possessed, the Prophet told the angels that as they had been commanded to obey him he would tell them to repeat *Amen* after what he prayed for. All agreeing, the Prophet raised his hands and said: "*Alla huma ihdi khowmi fu innahum la yalamoon.*" God lead my people into the direct path as they know not. He was repeating this prayer and the angels were saying *Amen, Amen*. Omar represented to the Prophet that a curse should be pronounced on the persecutors as they had greatly injured him. The Prophet said: "O Omar! I came to this world to bless and not to curse." What more forbearance is required than this? On the contrary it is written in the Bible that Christ used to call Jews 'sons of serpents.' The Missionary left for Lahore on Wednesday and the Moulvi Sahib not hearing anything from him wrote a letter and delivered over to Abraham the Catechist. No reply was received from the Missionary but Babu Janki Nath, the Head Master addressed the following letter on behalf of the Revd. Olent, Principal of the St. Stephen's College, Delhi.

22nd December 1890.

MY DEAR MOULVI SHARF-UL HAQ,

Your letter addressed to Revd. Lefroy reached me. Revd. Lefroy having proceeded to Lahore has been unable to write to you. As he had no opportunities to answer queries in full on the last day of the discussion, it would, therefore, be necessary to discuss the same subject. Please come to-morrow the 23rd December 1890 to St. Stephen's College, Delhi at 2 P. M. We would make the necessary arrangements for your convenience. Please let me know of your coming.

Yours, etc.,

(Signed) JANKI NATH,

Head Master,

On the receipt of this letter a reply was immediately sent to the effect that should the points already discussed and settled, be again brought forward, there would be no end to the controversy, and that being unable to answer the objections it was very easy for any one to postpone the discussion and to set out on a journey for the purpose of picking up information about the subject in several towns and again be ready to argue on the same point. The Head Master did not answer to this letter but sent word that the Missionary would come from Lahore and would send a reply to the same. The Missionary returned to Lahore on Tuesday at 12 noon and neither replying to the letter sent, nor fixing the subject for another discussion, sent for the Moulvi Sahib. Though to go there was contrary to practice, yet the Mahomedans went to the place for the purpose of making known the truth.

Proceedings of the third Day.

Tuesday 23rd December 1890. On this day there were present Maulana Allah Din, Moulvi Abdul Haq, author of the Tafseer-i-Hukham, Hakeem Ahmed Sayied Khan Sahib, Hakeem Ojmul Khan Sahib son of Hakim Ghulam Mahomed Khan Sahib the famous native doctor of Delhi, Sherik Nur Ahmed Sahib, Shaik Nur Mali Sahib and several others. The Reverend

Mr. Lefroy had with him the Revds. Kelly, Tegg, Head Master Janki Nath and Mr. Charles Metro and many other Native Christians. Altogether there were about 500 persons. The proceedings were opened by the Rev. Mr. Lefroy who thanked those assembled and apologised for want of room. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq then stood up and read a sermon containing the praise of God and the truth of Muhammad's prophecy and said that it was necessary for the Missionary to prescribe the subject of controversy, so that all assembled might know the subject under discussion. He said that the subject about the prophecy was already discussed and the Missionary's silence and inability to answer the point at issue decided the day in his favor. Now it was necessary that the Missionary should discuss some other point, but before he did so it would be well for him to prove the two prophecies he mentioned, as well as the third which he pointed out from Joshua, chapter vii, v. 14. Besides it was the duty of the Missionary to prove that some foretelling was necessary for the last of the prophets and that Christ was the last prophet. The Missionary hearing this said that he had to say something more about the prophecy mentioned in chapter xviii of Deuteronomy. There were two things in the prophecy; first an assertion and second a comparison. The assertion was "from the midst of thee, of thy brethren," and the comparison was "like unto Moses." From the above it was evident that the prophecy referred to Christ as he was one of the children of Israel, and like unto Moses. The phrase "from the midst of thee" did not admit of any doubt that the foretold prophet would rise from amongst the Israelites. After saying this he resumed his seat and Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq stood up and said that it was most irregular that a subject which had already been treated of and decided should be brought up again. He deprecated the pretention of the Missionary on Wednesday when the latter excused himself of headache after a discussion of two hours and-a-half; still he was ready to refute what the Missionary had said. 'In the prophecy,' said the Moulvi, "there are three things, assertion, comparison and a distinctive sign; the last of which has made such a strong impression on the Mis-

sionary that, however, much he may endeavour to make it suit Christ appropriately, the prophecy declares otherwise. The assertion is that the prophet will not be of the children of Israel; for if the prophet is to rise of the children of Israel, God will not have said "from their brethren," but would have declared from amongst those who were present or from their children as was minutely discussed by him on the previous occasion and to which the Missionary had nothing to say. The second is the comparison that the prophet will be like Moses and the resemblance is to be found in Mahomed which has been already shewn. If the expression is to Jesus, the word of God does not seem to be true." The Moulvi wanted to know what comparison was there between God and a servant. Christ was Moses' creator and God and as Christians believe Moses was Christ's slave and worshipper. Besides, according to the belief of the Missionary, Moses was not even a perfect man while Christ was the ideal of perfection. In accordance with the belief of the Missionary Christ was cast into Hell for the salvation of his followers and was cursed for being crucified. Moses was neither cast into hell nor was he crucified, thus becoming cursed. Christ ransomed his life for his servants whereas Moses neither did do so, nor any one believes him to have done so. The third distinctive mark (20). "But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall be killed," was not applicable in any wise to Christ, but it clearly referred to Muhammad. If it was made applicable to Christ, it would follow that according to the belief of the Christians, Christ was one who presumed to speak in the name of God words which he was not commanded to speak, which meant that he himself assumed the title of God and that against the wishes of God and contrary to the instructions of the Old Testament, he instructed his disciple in the belief in three Gods—Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost—to utter which was entirely forbidden as in chap. xx. v. iii. of Exodus wherein God commands "thou shalt have no other God before me." Besides this proposition would greatly strengthen the condemnation of

Christ by the Jews, who say that because Christ was heard speaking things which were against the law, he was killed. This, the Moulvi said, was the same distinctive mark which he so closely explained in the discussion, on Wednesday when the Missionary being unable to reply, was repeatedly asking his assistants to help him with an answer. A reply to his argument, said the Moulvi, was nothing more than to agree that the prophecy was for Mahomed. Since the Missionary had again mooted the question, he would say something more about the phrase—"unto thee." Now admitting for the sake of argument alone the signification which the Missionary ascribed to the words, it stood to reason that one of the expressions was explanatory of the other, both being identical in meaning. In other words "from unto thee" meant the same thing as "of thy brethren." As the words could not be found in chap. xviii. of Deuteronomy, in the Acts chap. iii, v. 22 and chap. vii. v.-3, and are only found in the words of Moses, they went to prove that they were added sometime afterwards and even the preference should be given to God's words and not to those of Moses. When the phrase "unto thee" was accepted it would be necessary to omit "of thy brethren" if not the whole thing would be an absurdity. The Moulvi said that the Missionary had, in the course of a week, learned two words—assertion and comparison—but did not mention the meaning attached to each—with reference to the prophecy under discussion, so the Moulvi hoped that the Missionary when speaking again would give out the meanings of these words with reference to the prophecy, also the kind of comparison. About the points of resemblance, said the Moulvi, he had already detailed them one by one and that it was unnecessary for him to repeat them. If the Missionary pleased himself in saying that Christ was the seed of Israel and therefore the foretold prophet, he was wrong as Christ was not of the children of Israel. The pedigree evidently came down from father and not from mother, and Christ had no father. The Moulvi wanted him to reply to his discourse minutely and not to have recourse to his former plan, and sat down. The Missionary standing said that there was

nothing inconsistent in the absence of the phrase "from unto thee" in other places, as all had the same signification and that the Moulvi was raising objections against the word of God, and that he mentioned what he liked in some places, while he did not do so in other places; and that he would not accept the Moulvi's construction of the phrase "from unto thee" as he preferred to accept the meanings given to it by Moses to the signification, the Moulvi Sahib tried to attach to the same. The prophecy therefore said the Missionary, referred to Moses and not to Muhammad and that it was thus necessary for the Moulvi to mention the prophecies about Muhammad as proved by him. Having said this the Missionary resumed his seat. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq again stood up and expressed his regret that the Missionary did not reply to any of the points raised in the previous controversy about the unsuitability of the comparison, the distinctive mark, the disobedience of Christ in preaching contrary to the commandments of God and lastly about the prophecy in chap. i of John. From this it was quite apparent that the Revd. gentlemen was conscious of the result and his promise of embracing the faith of Islam. Who was that prophet that claimed prophecy after Christ and how it was that the holy Peter preached the non-fulfilment of the prophecy mentioned in Deuteronomy, and said that the foretold prophet would come between the interval of Christ's going to and coming back from heaven. The same had been said from Samuel down by all prophets. So it happened that God raised Muhammad after Christ and since the Missionary was silent when he first mentioned these arguments it meant nothing more than consent. To say that there was no inconsistency in the words of God and that Moses was rather unjust on the part of the Missionary. Would not there happen a great difference in the meaning by such a change, it would then necessarily follow that God in the Scriptures had spoken absurd things unless in the particular phrase under controversy, one was to be accepted as explanatory of the other. The Moulvi Sahib said that it was necessary for the Missionary to give a reply fearing the day of resurrection. He was but a humble person and quite unfit, said the Moulvi, to

raise objection to the words of God, but the Missionary was skilled in such things as was evident from his attaching different meanings to the words of God—meanings which neither Peter nor Paul ever dreamt of. As to the Missionary's statement that he would accept the words of Moses more than the signification which the Moulvi had pointed out. Sharf-ul-Haq said that Moses was with Mussalmans and not with Christians as he clearly said that God would raise that prophet among the children of Ismael, who are the brethren of the children of Israel and that he would like him in establishing the unity of God and in confining to the results of the acts committed. Preceding a little further Moses says that God will, for them and from their brethren (the Ismaelites) raise a prophet. After saying this the Moulvi invited the attention of the audience to consider and note whether Moses was for the Mussulmans or for the Christians? It had again and again been established that the prophecy referred to Muhammad and not to Christ. The Moulvi after this conjured the Missionary to answer the point about the distinctive mark that if the prophet said that which he was not commanded to do he should be skilled. The Moulvi denied the statement made by the Missionary that Sharf-ul-Haq had promised to bring in writing a number of prophecies by saying that he never said so, but told that he was prepared to point out more prophecies after the Missionary proved his assertions that prophecy was necessary for the last of the prophets, and that Christ was the last prophet. The Moulvi Sahib sat down after saying this and the Missionary rising said: "What the holy Peter says is explained in the Acts chap. iii. v. 14." Thus "But ye denied the Holy one and the Just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you, (15) and killed the Prince of Life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses, (16) and his name through faith is his name hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know; yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all. (17) And now brethren, I know through ignorance ye did it, as also did your rulers, (18) But these things which God before had shewed by the

mouth of all his prophets, that Christ should suffer, he hath so fulfilled. (19) Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord; (20) and he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you: (21) Whom the heaven must receive until the time of the resurrection of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. (22) For Moses truly said unto the fathers, a prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear in all things whatsoever he shall say unto you. (26) Unto you God send Jesus &c." After reading the above the Missionary said that if it was the intention of Peter to speak about Muhammad here, he had no necessity to do so as he was addressing the Jews to the effect that they had killed such a holy one and had persecuted him and that faith in him had enabled the speaker to cure sick persons. If he had to mention the prophecy about Muhammad he should have mentioned many and would have said something about Muhammad's birth. Even Peter mentions the prophecy in Deuteronomy as referring to Christ, for in the passage reference is made to Christ alone. With regard to the prophecy mentioned in chap. i. verse 21 of John "that Prophet" refers to Christ alone, see chap. i. v. 45 of the same book: "Philip findeth Nathaneal and saith unto him, we have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." Christ was mentioned by Moses in the Old Testament and by John in the New Testament; so it was necessary for the Moulvi to mention some other prophecy about Muhammad, as he had already promised. If he the Moulvi failed to mention any more it would be clear that there were no more prophecies for him to mention. After the Missionary sat down, the Moulvi Sahib stood up and said how unfair it was on the part of the Missionary not to take notice of the several resemblances that were between Moses and Muhammad, and although 'assertion' and 'comparison' were the words introduced by the Missionary he has failed to prove that Christ resembled Moses in any one respect. Besides the

Missionary had said nothing about the distinctive mark that if the prophet was found to give instruction about other gods he should be killed. His repeated requests, said the Moulvi, about those things which demanded a reply from the Missionary not having been attended to, it was clear that the Missionary could not consciously assert that the prophecy was about Christ; that the Moulvi was sorry that Mr. Lefrey should think it advisable to leave out of discussion most important points for fear that their acceptance would compel him to redeem his promise of becoming a Mussalman himself. With regard to chap. iii. of the Acts, Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq replied that he was prepared to read the Acts from the first chapter as he said that there was nothing which would prevent the narrator to mention something about Muhammad while treating of Christ. He, the Moulvi, laid stress that since Peter was telling the people of the great acts and benefices which God had done and was to do which included the coming of Christ and the advent of Muhammad, he enumerated to them one by one and in doing so he was not prohibited by any of the Gospels. Nor was it unlawful to mention something about a different prophet in narrating of a particular prophet and referred as his authority to chap. i, v. 20 and 21 of John wherein a mention was made in one place of three prophets. Secondly, Peter here mentioned about Christ's coming from heaven and Muhammad also had to come. Thirdly the same disciple said of many things which would happen during this interval and one of those was the advent of Muhammad (peace be to him). Fourthly in verse 26 of chap. iii. the words 'he first raised his son Christ and sent unto you' proved that something happened first and another thing would happen hereafter and that was the coming of Muhammad in the interval. The Missionary's statement that more prophecies should be mentioned would be acceptable only under the condition that he should first of all prove that his holy book was free from anagrams. But since the Rev. gentleman had with his own pen attested to the untrustworthiness of his own Book, how could he now insist on more prophecies. It was possible that more prophecies mentioned by Peter had been removed from the

book by certain anagramists. Accepting this particular portion free from anagram, the Missionary, before raising any objection to what had been said, should by sound reasons prove the collection in one place of five or more prophecies for one single prophet and unless he did so there was no need for Mahomedans to argue uselessly. Besides in his book there were things which disproved his claim. The Missionary's other statement that if prophecy was for Muhammad something about his birth would have been mentioned was also wrong and unacceptable, particularly so as he did not lay down any rule for the prophecy. He should first point out the prophecies in the Old Testament about Moses, Zechariah and John, and then should show the necessity for the mention of birth. After doing so the Moulvi said 'let the Missionary ask about such things.' Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq then said that the erroneous statement of the Missionary about the prophecy mentioned in chap. vii, verse 14 of Joshua was known to one and all and similarly the prophecy mentioned in the Acts from chap. 18, verse 18 of Deuteronomy in no way referred to Christ; for in the first verses mention was already made of Christ and in the following verses some events were mentioned to take place between Christ's coming from and going to heaven, and this interval was the time of Muhammad's birth and rise. It was quite unfair that the prophecy for others should unreasonably be made applicable to Christ. Concerning chap. i. v. 45 of John, the Moulvi said that accepting Philip an inspired person what necessity was there that the prophecy in chap. 18, verse 18 of Deuteronomy and that of chap. i. verse 21 of John should also be forcibly made to refer to Christ. He further said: 'Do not the Christians think that Christ is referred to in chap. iii. verse 15 and in chap. xix. verse 10 of Genesis?' If the words "that prophet" should be made applicable to Christ no sane person would ever credit such a thing, as the question about Christ and Elias had already been answered, and John denied that he was neither of the two. To reiterate that the words "that prophet" referred to Christ was nothing but absurd. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq repeated his previous statement that he did not promise the Mis-

sionary that he would point out many a prophecy and that he had brought them in writing. He requested the Missionary to commit to paper as before what had been discussed about the prophecies in Joshua chap. 7. v. 14; John chap. 1. v. 21; Deuteronomy chap. 18. v. 18; and Acts chap. 3. verses 21-22; and after that to prove that prophecy was necessary for the last of the prophets and that Christ was the last prophet. The Moulvi Sahib said that he would point out the prophecies about Mahomed after the Missionary did what was required of him, for, he said that until the result of the discussion was committed to paper there was no use to proceed further. After saying this, the Moulvi Sahib sat down, and the Missionary said that he was averse to the discussion for the reason that the Moulvi was in the habit of publishing such discussions in pamphlets and circulating them widely and therefore he would not write down what was discussed. The Moulvi Sahib replied that the object of publication was to benefit those who were not present at the discussion and asked the Missionary the reason for his refusal while he did write on the previous occasion. If free discussion of the matter under controversy should not tend to decide the points at issue, he did not know how such points would have to be settled. The Missionary replied that the prophecy he mentioned was for illustration and the similar prophecy mentioned by the Moulvi was to the same effect; he was therefore not prepared to say much and asked the Moulvi Sahib again to mention some other prophecies concerning Muhammad and enquired whether the Moulvi had only one stone to throw at him. The Moulvi jocularly replied that the stone he threw was so heavy that the Missionary with all his best endeavours and with the assistance of his friends could not remove it, and that to remove the stone the Missionary not only tried his utmost but set out on a journey to other places asking for help. He had not mentioned one prophecy only but several prophecies as mentioned in Deuteronomy chap. xviii; John chap i, and the Acts chap. iii. The Missionary said: "It is usual that when two pleaders dispute with each other, the one who is beaten does not admit of his defeat. If you had established what you

said, I would have as before, written what took place." The Moulvi after hearing this said that the Missionary's observation was incorrect inasmuch as the discussion was carried to the last degree. There were *pros and cons* and the Missionary was found unable to answer several objections, and when the Moulvi explained things under controversy he was not in a position to take objection to what was said. The Missionary was not able to say a word to the several points of resemblance mentioned nor was he in a position to explain the phrase "from thee" and of "thy brethren," and although the Moulvi laid great stress on the instruction the prophet was to impart to his followers, the Missionary kept quiet not saying a word about it. The Moulvi Sahib said he would again repeat the distinctive mark that if the prophet spoke of gods other than the real God he would be destroyed and asked the Missionary how it was that he intentionally omitted any reference to the mark. He pressed the Missionary to fulfil his promise and threatened him of God's vengeance saying that the present world was to last for a few days and that the world to come was everlasting. Sharf-ul-Haq said that unless the Missionary committed to paper what was discussed, he would not proceed further and insisted that the Missionary should prove his proposition that proof was necessary for the last of the prophets. Since the prophecies he mentioned were such that the Missionary had no reasonable ground to refute, it was plain that he did not express his consent for fear that doing so would end in his embracing Islam. The Missionary, continued the Moulvi, wrote down previously all that took place as there was no such condition of conversion, and now that this condition had been introduced he was afraid of its consequence. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq saying this resumed his seat and the Missionary standing as usual said that all those present knew well that he did not come prepared to argue on the points brought forward and that he would take up the discussion again when prepared. Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq on hearing this excuse said that it was rather strange on the part of the Missionary to excuse himself by saying that he was unprepared, for being a certified and an ordained Mission-

ary, who was supposed to know his own religion well, he should always be prepared to answer questions affecting his religion and defend his faith and prove his statements. The Moulvi Sahib said that the Missionary was a well-to do person, who had command over all his wants, whereas the Moulvi and his co-religionists had no such comforts, and with all that they expressed his readiness to meet the Missionary in any way he pleased in arguing the points under controversy, while the Missionary *with his command* enjoying all necessities of life fell back from discussing and did not, though repeatedly requested to say anything in regard to the distinctive mark of the prophet for which the Missionary would be held responsible on the day of resurrection. Moulvi Abdul Haq asked of the Moulvi Sharf-ul-Haq from what authority the latter would prove the cessation of prophecy and being answered that the prophecy would be established from the New Testament said that such an authority would not do for Mussalmans. Having said this Moulvi Abdul-Haq told the Moulvi that the necessity of the prophecy for the last of the prophets might be taken in the same light. Thus ended the controversy and all present clapped their hands in exultation of the triumph achieved and then the meeting was dissolved.

All praises are due to that Divine Being, who is the God of the beginning and the end—God who has power over all things known and hidden; and salutation and peace to our Lord and Master Muhammed the best of the creation and to his descendants, companions and to all of his friends.

—:O:—

SOME OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE CRUCIFIED CHRIST.

After the praises due to God and the Prophet asserts Sharf-ul-Huq Jalali and Sabiri, an humble servant of all the Mussalmans, to the effect that all know well how the Reverend G. A. Lefroy, Head of the Cambridge Mission sustained a defeat in the recent controversy and having admitted anagrams in the Holy Scriptures gave a written statement to that effect. But the Revd. T. Williams of Rewadi, author of "*Mahomed Ki. twarikh Ka Ijmal*," appears to be a man of such an arrogant and

shameless nature that he has thought fit to abuse in the most revolting language Muhammad (peace be to his name) whose Prophetic Mission is so well proved from the Bible that the Reverend Lefroy would have, but for the sake of Mission, embraced Islam. Mr. Williams, forgetting the obligations that Christians owe to Muhammad for defending the cause of Christ against the attacks of the Jews and his admirable proof of Christ's wonderful birth, uses in his cursed book such harsh phrases against the Prophet which are at once revolting in their nature and point to the world the ungratefulness of the author. Had Muhammad not been sent by God, neither the wonderful birth of Christ nor his Prophetic Mission would have been accepted and no one would have believed in Messiah. The Revd. Williams writes in his book that "Muhammad left Mecca and fled to Medina &c."

I say that the God of the Christians leaving all the world hid himself in the womb of the Virgin Mary as a fœtus and remained within for nine months, fed on the usual food and then came out as the second God, but it was to be regretted that the world did not pity his weakness. He was forcibly crucified and was according to Paul cursed. (I bring myself under the protection of God from such faith.)

The Revd. Williams writes "that the result was quite the reverse, the Jews thought him an Impostor." He seems to have no knowledge of his own religion founded by Paul and the Missionary pleases himself by quoting what the Jews say. For his pleasure I also quote the statements of the Jews who say that the crucified Christ was an Impostor and an infidel and declared that there were three Gods and called himself God; he was a man without a father as his father was not known and prove these statements from the genealogy written by Mathew. Perhaps the Revd. Mr. Williams would approve of the opinion of the Jews, and should this be his belief, he ought to be afraid of God before whom he should one day or other return. If the Missionary objected to the change of *Kibla* he must satisfy himself by seeing Mathew chap. v. 32 and comparing the same with the law of Moses as to how God made

a divorce lawful in the case of adultery. The taking of two sisters at one time as wives was once lawful and accordingly Jacob married two sisters, but this was prohibited in the law of Moses.

Mr. Williams writes "that Muhammad saw her beauty &c." The Missionary seems to be one of the greatest liars on the face of the earth who accuses innocent persons and in blaspheming the holy person of the Prophet incurs grave responsibility and punishment on the day of Judgment. He ought to prove his statements from some quotations from the *Al-Koran* or from the traditions. The Jews say that the God of Christians was so unchaste that he cast his eye on the *wife* of Joseph the Carpenter and spoiled her. I bring myself under the protection of God from such nonsenses. It would have been better for the Missionary to have pleased himself by reading his wretched pamphlet alone to the Lord Bishop and thus save himself from such ignominy.

The Missionary writes "that Christ is sinless according to the Commandments of the Old Testament." But in my opinion this is entirely wrong. If the Trinity is true and if Jesus claimed to be of Divine origin, he then violated the command of God "Thou shalt have no other God before me" and therefore the Jews say that Christ was in consequence crucified as prophesied in chap. xviii, v. 20, Deuteronomy. Now leaving all the disrespectful and revolting statements which Mr. William's book contain for the vengeance of God I do reply very concisely to certain objections raised in the book promising a detailed refutation at leisure. The Missionary has spoken very disparagingly and in an abusive language of *Jahāl* and Polygamy forgetting that the holy books believed in by him contain severer things than what have been accepted by the Mussulmans. He must look into Numbers chap. xxxi v-7 to the end : "and they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord commanded Moses ; and they slew all the males, (8) and they slew the Kings of Midian, besides the rest of them were slain ; *namely* Evi, Rekem, and Zur, and Hur, and Reba, five kings of Midian : Balaam also the son of Boer they slew with the sword.

(9) And the children of Israel took all the women of Midian captives, and their little ones, and took the spoil of all their cattle, and all their flocks, and all their goods. (10) And they burnt all their cities wherein they dwelt, and all their goodly castles, with fire. (11) And they took all the spoil, and all the prey both of men and of beasts. (12) And they brought the captives and the prey and the spoil unto Moses, and Elcazar the priest, and unto the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the camp at the plains of Moab, which are by Jordan near Jerico. (13) And Moses and Elcazar the priest, and all the princes of the congregation, went forth to meet them without the camp. (14) And Moses was wroth with the officers of the host, with the Captains over thousands, and Captains over hundreds, which came from the battle. (15) And Moses said unto them. Have ye saved all the women alive? (16) Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against the Lord in the matter of Peor, and there was a plague among the congregation of the Lord. (17) Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. (18) But all the women, children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." Now the Missionary, who has used such indecent language against that perfection of morality, the Prophet of Islam, should feel ashamed that God and his partaker the crucified Christ was one with his father in this order he should shun the Trinity. Besides the Missionary should ponder well that in calling Muhammad the leader of Dacoits, what a shameless sin he has committed seeing that the God of Christians, divided as he is in the Trinity, did allow the greatest cruelty to be perpetrated over the innocent women and children and permitted the spoils to be distributed among the Dacoits who had been deputed for the purpose by him. This "leader of Dacoits" allowed the murder of women and children and permitted the untouched matured among them to be kept by dacoits (Vide Versc 31). The Prophet never allowed such a cruelty over women and children and was always ordering pity to be shown to women, yet the author of

the cursed pamphlet has spoken such audacious words against him that no sane person will ever utter. I should invite the Missionary's attention to verses 36, 38, 49 and 50 of Luke that how the crucified Christ thinking it incumbent upon himself to follow the way of all the other prophets in this particular respect ordered to prepare for the same and enjoined the purchase of sword by selling their garments and allowed by consent the striking with sword and satisfied himself by the cutting of ear of the servant of the priest. With regard to the objection taken to Polygamy I have not much to say; suffice it to say that if polygamy was so bad why was it that the Missionary's second God, the crucified Christ—allowed his grand-father David to indulge in polygamy and permitted Solomon to have a thousand wives. If the plurality of wives was a sin, God would have prohibited Jacob, Abraham and other prophets from doing the same, and should it now be considered unlawful it would follow that all the children of those prophets born of the several wives were bastards. If the Prophet was voluptuous, as remarked by the Missionary he would not have married widows mostly, but would have virgins for his wives. Whereas the Jews say the crucified Christ appears to be more voluptuous as it is said he was allowing young women and virgins to anoint his legs etc. The Prophet did not marry till about he was twenty five years old and when he married he took to wife an elderly lady of 40 years which goes to prove that this holy personage was not for the world but in the words of the Missionary acted as ordered by God. Does the Missionary know anything about the Son of his God as to how he is accused by the Jews who state that the crucified Christ was always among women who loved him; was among beardless boys; was wandering with women and used to be anointed by them and his relations with Mary Magdalena were such that he frequented her house and that he considered women to be a field to be ploughed by any one. The Revd. Mr. Lefroy never uses such words as Mr. Williams. As regards *Hajri Asvad* the Missionary writes that the Mahomedans worship it, and in answer to this charge I say *lanat-ullahi-alal Cazibin*, let God's curse descend on these who lie. The Missionary does not

know that Mussalmans do not worship anything except the only God ; any one who makes *Sijda* to the Prophet or does any such things to him is considered by them to be a *Mushrik* or infidel. Such being the case how is it possible that the Missionary launches forth such groundles accusations. Whatever he asserts he should prove from the approved doctrines, and not merely by hearsay. In whatever I have written above I have followed the course adopted by the Missionary in copying the statements of the Jews which I would not have done otherwise as I believe equally in all the prophets. I bear witness that there is but one God and that Jesus is his servant and prophet and that Muhammad is his servant and friend and that God's salutation be to him, his descendants and all his companions—Amen !

FINIS.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS.

—:0:—

	NAMES.	Amount.		
		RS.	A.	P.
1	Mahomed Ali Sahib, Esqr., Khan Bahadur ...	15	0	0
2	Abdur Rahman Sahib, Esq., 2nd Class Magistrate ...	15	0	0
2	Ismail Sait Sahib, grandson of Mittha Kasim Sait Sahib ...	10	0	0
4	Munshi Abdul Aziz Sahib, son of Hyder Hosein Sahib ...	9	0	0
5	From people of Qazi Mohalla, through Yasin Sahib and Mohamed Yakoob Sahib ...	8	0	0
6	Collected in the boxes kept at Cow and Sheep Butchers' Mosques &c. ...	14	5	8
7	Collected in the boxes on 11th August 1893 ...	6	1	0
8	Chowdhri Mohamed Oosman Sahib ...	5	0	0
9	Moulvie Jalaludin Sharf-ul-Haq Sahib M. M. ...	4	1	0
10	Chowdhri Madar and Mohamed Hosein Sahib ...	4	0	1
11	Abdul Hameed Sahib ...	2	0	0
12	Mohamed Obaidullah Sahib ...	2	0	0
13	Munshi Abdul Jalil Sahib ...	2	0	0
	Do do ...	2	4	0
14	Ghous Beg Sahib ...	2	0	0
15	Oomer Sahib ...	2	0	0
16	Ahmad Khan Sahib ...	2	0	0
17	Shekh Buddhan Sahib ...	2	0	0
18	Ghaseeta Vali Ahmed Sahib ...	2	0	0
19	Karim Badshah Sahib ...	2	0	0
20	T. Qadir Badshah Sahib ...	2	0	0
21	Saleh Mohamed Ali Mohamed Sait Sahib ...	2	0	0
22	Burhanuddin Sahib, contractor ...	2	0	0
23	Shop Madar Sahib ...	2	0	0
24	Mohamed Qasim Sahib (Blackpalli) ...	1	0	0
25	Syed Abdur Razzak Sahib ...	1	0	0
26	Abdul Qadir Sahib ...	1	0	0
27	Shekh Hyder Sahib ...	1	0	0
28	Butler Abdur Rahim Sahib ...	1	0	0
29	Mohamed Sulaiman Sahib ...	1	0	0
30	Ibrahim Sahib (Fire-work manufacturer) ...	1	0	0
31	Hajee Mohamed Ali Sahib ...	1	0	0
32	Vellore Sahibroo Md. Jafer Sahib ...	1	0	0
33	Hyder Khan Sahib (Contractor) ...	1	0	0
34	Ismail Beg (of furniture shop) ...	1	0	0
35	Bokhari Peeran Sahib ...	1	0	0
36	Ghulam Hosein Sahib, (Pentioned Soobadar) ...	1	0	0
37	Hafiz Abdullah Sahib ...	1	0	0
38	Abdussubhan Sahib (Pensioned Jemadar) ...	1	0	0
39	Hyder Khan Sahib (Dealer in betel leaves) ...	1	0	0

	NAMES.	Amount.		
		RS.	A.	P.
40	Sahibjoo Kotay (lawyer) ...	...	1	0 0
41	Fakhruddin Sahib (Contractor Bamboo Merchant) ...	...	1	0 0
42	Shop Abdul Ghafoor Sahib ...	...	1	0 0
43	Calicut Abdul Ghafoor Sahib (Tobacco Merchant) ...	...	1	0 0
44	Maddagiri Meer Qadir Ali Sahib ...	...	1	0 0
45	Chowdhri Abdul Wahab Sahib (Bamboo Merchant) ...	...	1	0 0
46	Vellore Abdul Razzak Sahib (Blackpulli) ...	...	1	0 0
47	Goray Mohamed Sahib ...	...	1	0 0
48	Mahomed Oosman Sahib, Soobadar 24th Regiment ...	...	1	0 0
49	Abul Kayyum Sahib, Soobedar 24th Regiment ...	...	1	0 0
50	Miskeen Hayath Sahib ...	...	1	0 0
51	Miskeen Ali Sahib ...	...	1	0 0
52	Mohamed Sahib ...	...	0	8 0
53	Rajay Mohamed Sahib (Butcher) ...	...	0	8 0
54	Rahim Khan Sahib ...	...	0	8 0
55	Mohammad Sahib (Potato merchant) ...	...	0	8 0
56	Mohamed Wahid Ali Khan Sahib ...	...	0	8 0
57	Hajee Abdullah Sahib ...	...	0	8 0
58	Abdul Hadi Sahib ...	...	0	4 0
59	Qasim Shariff Sahib ...	...	0	4 0
60	Lathief Shariff Sahib ...	...	0	4 0
61	Mohamed Sahib (Contractor) ...	...	0	4 0
62	Shekh Daood Sahib (Athlete) ...	...	0	4 0
63	Gujree Mohamed Sulaiman Sahib ...	...	0	4 0
64	Abdul Qadir Sahib ...	...	0	2 0
65	Hamced Khan Sahib (Pensioned sepoy) ...	...	0	1 0
66	Mahomed Sahib, son of late Shukoorn Din ...	...	*20	0 0
67	Paktani Qader Badsha Sahib ...	...	*8	0 0
68	Collected in boxes on the 17th August 1899 ...	...	7	4 3
69	Do do do ...	...	0	1 0
70	Shaik Madar Sahib, Binder, Morning Star Press ...	...	0	2 0

*This amount was given to defray foreign postage.

